

Chairman - Councillor R M Sutherland

Present (for all or part of the meeting):-

Councillors:

F Beatty	J Hood
B M Cross	W J Kemp
A P Edgeller	A Nixon
A S Harp	A N Pearce
A D Hobbs	M Phillips

Also in Attendance - Councillors R Kenney and B McKeown.

Officers in attendance:-

Mr J Holmes	-	Development Manager
Mrs D Templeton	-	Senior Planning Officer
Mrs J McGoldrick	-	Principal Solicitor
Mr A Bailey	-	Scrutiny Officer

PC1 Minutes

Minutes of the previous meeting held on 24 April 2019 were submitted and signed.

PC2 Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M G Dodson (Substitute Councillor F Beatty).

PC3 Declarations of Members Interests/Lobbying

Councillor F Beatty indicated that she would be speaking on behalf of the Barlaston Ward Member in respect of Application Numbers 18/28215/FUL and 18/29364/FUL.

Councillor F Beatty declared a personal interest in Application No 18/29781/COU as the Council's representative on the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Joint Committee.

Councillor B M Cross declared a personal interest in Application No19/30263/HOU because he knew the applicant as a former Member.

Councillor A P Edgeller declared a personal interest in Application No19/30263/HOU because she knew the applicant as a former Member.

Councillor A N Pearce declared a personal interest in Application No19/30263/HOU because he knew both the applicant and the objector.

Councillor F Beatty left the table and sat in the public gallery during consideration of the following two applications.

PC4 **Application No 18/28215/FUL - Proposed demolition of existing garage blocks, local convenience shop, and bungalow; and the creation of 13 new bungalows and local convenience shop - Land at Ivyhouse Drive, Barlaston, Stoke on Trent**

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr S Ord raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- A local resident
- Car parking was an issue in the area
- The estate was built during the 1970's and was not future proofed
- Some of the houses should have private drives
- The garages were large enough to fit cars in them
- Parts of the estate had laybys for cars
- This proposal would remove 50 garages
- Access to the garages was an issue
- This was an isolated estate with limited civil amenities
- The local convenience shop had recently closed

Mr H Rayet raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke in support of the proposal
- Stafford and Rural Homes had built over 70 houses in rural exception sites
- Affordable housing was very popular
- There was a strong demand for bungalows for over 55's who wanted to downsize
- The site had been carefully chosen
- The garages were used largely for storage only
- There was a large demand for property in the area
- Stafford and Rural Homes had a successful track record
- Requested the Committee to support the application

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor F Beatty, who was representing the Barlaston Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- In favour of Stafford and Rural Homes' proposal
- Parking was an area of concern
- Many residents parked on grass verges or any available space that created a "Free for all" attitude
- If approved, the issue of parking needed to be addressed in the conditions
- Requested the Committee to visit the site in order to fully understand the parking problems

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- After working hours cars were usually parked on either side of Ivyhouse Drive
- The local shop was currently closed
- The garages were used for cars
- Clarification of the footpaths around the site
- The Parish Council had not objected to the proposals
- This was a brownfield site within the North Staffordshire Greenbelt
- Clarification that all of the proposed dwellings would be affordable housing
- Clarification of the conditions relating to ecology and construction noise

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A P Edgeller and seconded by Councillor A S Harp that Application No 18/28215/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 18/28215/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC5 **Application No 18/29364/FUL - Proposed Erection of single detached dwelling and garage - Land adjacent 104 Longton Road, Barlaston, Stoke-on-Trent**

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

The Development Manager reported upon the receipt of two additional neighbour representations in support of the proposal.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr T Earley raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- This application was disappointing as there had been no attempt to reduce the size of the footprint
- The visual massing effect would be increased by this proposal
- It would have an over bearing affect on the streetscene
- The submitted plans and photographs did not show the true picture
- Members should trust the views of previous Committees
- The location was in a rural aspect, which would be destroyed by this proposal
- The property dated back to 1851
- The property would have been built with a hedge
- The proposal was not justified and was too ambitious
- The application should be refused on the grounds of scale, mass and design

Mr A Hodgson raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- Spoke as the applicant
- Purchased the land last Summer with the outline planning permission
- Had endeavoured to keep the proposals in line with the outline permission
- Had repositioned the house by 1.4 m following the last meeting
- The layout remained similar
- The plot was 15.4 m wide and the proposed dwelling was 9.9 m wide
- The Planning Officer had recommended approval of the application
- The proposed dwelling had been repositioned as requested
- Would be happy to accept any conditions related to screening
- The residents adjacent 104 Longton Road had confirmed their support for the proposal
- This was an important part of a retirement plan
- Requested the Committee to approve the proposal

At the invitation of the Chairman, Councillor F Beatty, who was representing the Barlaston Ward Member, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The plot was fundamentally too small for the proposal
- The design of the house was too large
- The proposal was over bearing in terms of mass, width and scale
- The design was out of keeping with adjacent properties
- Privacy screening for the balcony may not be successful
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- The area was a mixture of styles
- The applicant had done everything possible to alleviate the problems
- Clarification of the proposal in relation to the telegraph pole
- The proposal was set back from the road and would not therefore be detrimental to the street scene.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A S Harp and seconded by Councillor A P Edgeller that Application No 18/29364/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 18/29364/FUL be approved, subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

Councillor F Beatty re-took her seat at the table.

PC6

Application No 18/29781/COU - Temporary change of use of the land to develop a temporary compound to facilitate off-site ground investigation works to cease before August 2020 - Hixon Airfield Industrial Estate, Hixon, Stafford, ST18 0PF

(Recommendation approve, subject to conditions and subject to no new material objections being received from Stowe-by-Chartley Parish Council by 29 May 2019)

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

The Development Manager reported upon additional representation received from Stowe-by-Chartley Parish Council in objection to the proposal and a response from the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation Team who are satisfied that the proposed application is unlikely to impact on either Pasturefields Salt Marsh (SAC & SSSI) and Chartley / West Midlands Mosses (SAC / Ramsar /SSSI)

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mr J Blount raised the following points during his objection to the proposal:-

- The report made no mention of the Hixon Neighbourhood Plan
- The Plan for Stafford Borough Policies E2 relating to Rural Sustainability and E3 relating to Recognised Industrial Estates had already been exceeded in Hixon
- The proposal was in conflict with Policy 7 of the Hixon Neighbourhood Plan in relation to pollution
- Requested the Committee to refuse the application

Mr M Marshall raised the following points during his support for the proposal:-

- The proposal was only short term, until August 2020
- There was no development proposed after that date
- The proposed compound was not permanent and not used in connection with the railway
- Clarified that the proposal was confined within the red lines of the plan
- The applicant had undertaken a comprehensive search for alternative sites
- Only a small part of the road was used for public access and would not be obstructed
- The proposal was important for national infrastructure
- Requested the Committee to approve the application

Councillor B McKeown, Haywood and Hixon Ward Member attended the Committee and at the invitation of the Chairman, addressed the Committee and raised the following issues:-

- The proposal was outside of the Hixon Industrial Estate boundary
- The report failed to mention the Hixon Neighbourhood Plan
- The report was heavily biased towards approval
- There was no evidence of a comprehensive search for suitable sites
- Referred to evidence that HS2 had already acquired 6 acres of land, with a further 8 acres safeguarded
- Therefore there were 14 acres of land already acquired and this proposal was not necessary
- Referred to various representations between Arup and the Local Planning Authority concerning Hixon
- It was important not to ignore Local Neighbourhood Plans

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- This proposal was temporary until 31 August 2020
- Concern that there was no reference to the Hixon Neighbourhood Plan
- Concern over the lack of detail of the biodiversity impact
- Concern that although temporary, traffic movements would still have an impact on the environment
- Confirmation that all proposed works were contained within the former runway

In response the Development Manager explained that the report did not suggest that the site was within the Recognised Industrial Estate and that an analysis of sites had been supplied by the applicant. He also confirmed that the Hixon Airfield Ecological Impact Assessment was available on the web site as part of the submitted documents.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A P Edgeller and seconded by Councillor M Phillips that Application No 18/29781/COU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 18/29781/COU be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC7 **Application No 19/30134/FUL - Proposed all-weather riding arena with area of hardcore, wooden post and rail fence to perimeter - Part of field rear of 9 Church Close, Ranton, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST18 9JE**

(Recommendation approve).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor A P Edgeller and seconded by Councillor B M Cross that Application No 19/30134/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 19/30134/FUL be approved, subject to the conditions as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC8 **Application No 19/30263/HOU - Proposed Conversion of former coach house to two bed annex - 18 Chapel Terrace, Stafford, ST16 3AH**

(Recommendation refuse).

Considered the report of the Head of Development regarding this matter.

Public speaking on the matter was as follows:-

Mrs M Jennings raised the following points during her support for the proposal:-

- The property was built in 1812
- The access was only 5m wide
- There was no parking available on site
- There were an increasing number of vehicles trying to park in the area and this was creating a blight
- The County Highways Authority were often at odds with the Local Planning Authority
- Referred to car parking standards

- The report quoted the County Highways Authority's reasons for refusal verbatim
- Only had one car and this proposal was for a dependent relative
- Would be happy to accept conditions if approved

The Committee discussed the application and raised a number of issues, including:-

- Shoppers often parked in the area and blocked residents in
- There were also issues in collecting refuse
- There was a commercial business in the area
- The applicant only had one car
- Access to emergency vehicles was a concern

In response, the Development Manager confirmed that there were no available parking spaces and the property could be later sold to an owner who owned multiple vehicles.

It was subsequently moved by Councillor W J Kemp and seconded by Councillor J Hood that Application No 19/30263/HOU be refused for the reason as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

On being put to the vote the proposal was declared to be carried.

RESOLVED:- that planning application no 19/30263/HOU be refused for the reason as set out in the report of the Head of Development.

PC9

Planning Appeals

Considered the report of the Head of Development.

Notification of the following appeals had been received:-

(a) New Appeals

App No	Location	Proposal
18/28129/FUL Delegated Refusal	Temporary Dwelling In Connection With Equestrian Centre Wharf Road Adbaston Stafford	Retention of Existing Temporary Rural Workers Mobile Home for a Further Temporary Period.
18/29181/FUL Delegated Refusal	Land Adjacent Penmere Drive Clayton Newcastle Under Lyme	New dwelling.
18/29380/FUL Delegated Refusal	Manor Farm Barns, High Ridge Barn Well Lane High Offley	Proposed conversion of stables and storage areas into single storey dwelling.

(b) Appeal Decisions

App No	Location	Proposal
18/29577/HOU Dismissed	Netherfield 7 Barnes Croft Hilderstone Stone	Conversion of loft space in existing garage to habitable room with toilet facilities plus four roof lights. Re siting existing garden wall to edge of homeowner boundary, retaining existing grassed service strip.

CHAIRMAN